

## **REMARKS**

The Final Office Action of May 15, 2009 has been carefully considered by Applicants. Applicants respectfully request that the next office action, if issued, not be made final. Applicants may desire an opportunity to conduct one or more Examiner interviews to further prosecution of this case. Claims 1-9 and 11-29 are presently pending. Claims 1-9 and 11-22 have been rejected. Claims 1, 13, 19, and 20 are amended. Claims 23-30 are newly added. No new matter has been added.

### **Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-9 and 11-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alcorn (U.S. Patent No. 6,149,522).

Applicant believes the rejection is deficient for the following reasons. Claims as amended describe limitations, such as recited in claim 1, “***determining whether to hold said volatile programmable electronic device in a reset mode***”. Applicants believe the citations providing by the Examiner don’t teach or suggest a microprocessor based machine, such as a gaming machine, in the manner as described in the pending claims.

As described in the claims, a volatile programmable electronic device, such as a field programmable gate array, is disposed in a communication path between a CPU and a memory device storing the executable programming instructions for generating the wager-based game (see FIG. 3 of the pending application). The volatile programmable electronic device comprises a plurality of logic elements to form logic gates. The volatile programmable electronic device may be programmed to enable communications between the CPU and the memory device storing executable programming instructions for generating the wager-based game. Further, the operating contents said volatile programmable electronic may be held as substantially empty upon a shut down phase of said gaming machine to disable communication between the central processing unit and the memory device. In addition, the volatile programmable electronic device is configured to monitor a communication between the central processing unit and at least one of an input device and an output device. Further, there is a determination made whether to hold the volatile programmable electronic device in a reset mode. Applicants believe that the prior art citations provided by the Examiner don’t teach or suggest a gaming machine configured with a volatile programmable memory device

that is used in this manner. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Applicants believe the rejection is overcome thereby.

### **New Claims**

Claims 23 and 24 depend from independent claim 1, claims 25 and 26 depend from independent claim 13, claims 27 and 28 depend from independent claim 13, and claims 29 and 30 depend from independent claim 20, and the independent claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 23-30 are also patentable over the cited art.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, including any extension fees, which may be required or credit any overpayment directly to the account of the undersigned, No. 504480 (Order No. IGT1P096/P000824-001).

Respectfully submitted,

/ David P. Olynick /

David P. Olynick  
Registration No. 48,615  
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP  
P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100